



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

third edition is recorded in March and the fourth in May, but the novel was apparently incomplete in all these early editions. For we find a record in the "Register of Books" for December, 1741 (No. 31) to this effect: "Pamela. vol. 3 and 4 by the author of the two first. pr. 6 s. *Rivington*."

Another question that suggests itself in this connection is: If Richardson actually finished the novel on January 10, 1740, why did he keep it for ten months before publishing it? It would hardly have required so much time to get the two volumes thru the press. One easy way out of the difficulty created by Shenstone's letter is, of course, to assume that the editor of his works (his good friend Dodsley) dated the letter wrong. The first four letters of the collection are in each case dated "1739," and the first two of these four, as noted above, are addressed to Mr. Jago and seem to belong together. Moreover, this is the only one of the 1739 letters which bears at the end the definite dating (of the author himself, we must think): "Leasowes, July 22."

The possible assumption that Shenstone might have read the story in manuscript would not mend matters, as there are no cogent reasons for supposing that the poet and the novelist were ever intimately associated as friends,—even if we granted that Richardson was mistaken in his own dates of composition (Nov. 10, 1739 to Jan. 10, 1740). Other references to Richardson (there are not many) in the letters throw no light on the question of the date of publication of *Pamela*. Writing to his friend Graves in 1743⁷ he says: "Pamela would have made one good volume; and I wonder the author, who has some *nice* natural strokes, should not have sense enough to see that." Once or twice he casually mentions *Clarissa* and *Grandison*, and we know from a letter to Percy written in the last year but one of his life that Shenstone was an ardent admirer of Richardson's. Speaking of a "pompous edition of Thomson's works"⁸ he asks Percy: "And does not his monument put you in mind of what the Publick owes to Mr. Richardson? For my own part, I never look into his works but with greater Admiration of his Genius—and then, if we regard the extensive good they were so well calculated to promote, there are few characters to whom the Nation may be said to owe greater Honours."

So far as I am aware, Shenstone's letter has not been noticed by any of Richardson's biographers and critics, tho the reference to *Pamela*, explicit as it is, if it does not prove that the novel was in circulation as early as July, 1739, makes it incumbent upon the student of Richardson to show beyond a doubt that the letter is incorrectly dated.

WM. H. HULME.

Western Reserve University.

A CO-INCIDENCE EXPLAINED.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—In May 1909, I published in *Modern Language Notes* a paper on "Some Debts of Samuel Daniel to Du Bellay." The substance of this paper had appeared in an essay by Professor Kastner in the *Modern Language Review* of April, 1908, "The Elizabethan Sonneteers and the French Poets." What has the look of cool plagiarism was, however, in fact, an innocent co-incidence. My paper comprised part of a "report" made, in the course of the academic year 1907-1908, for Professor C. H. Page's course on French influence in the English Renaissance; a "report" which was read in that course before Professor Kastner's article was accessible here. Owing to press of work, I did not prepare the paper for publication until the following spring, when I sent it to *Modern Language Notes*. I myself, in making researches along other lines, discovered that Professor Kastner had anticipated me, and at once communicated with him. My explanation of the circumstances satisfied him, and I call attention to the co-incidence now only to spare possible students of this corner of a large subject any confusion in the matter.

CAROLINE RUUTZ-REES.

Greenwich, Conn.

THE *Nibelungenlied* AND *Sir Beves of Hampton*

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—A striking and curious parallel with the *Nibelungenlied* has, in so far as I know, been passed over unnoticed by those editing or commenting on the Old French and Middle English versions of *Sir Beves of Hampton*. The likeness is between the *Beves* "Episode in Cologne" and the story of the wedding of Gunther and Brunhild.

The *Nibelungenlied*¹ describes the wedding with fervor; afterwards, it tells how attendant maids and men escort the bridal couple to their rest; how Brunhild proffers her first request to her lord, and on being refused, takes rude vengeance. She seizes her girdle, ties with it his feet and hands, and hangs him up to a nail on the wall. "Jâ het er ir krefte vil nâch gewûnnên den tût."

¹ Bartsch, *Das Nibelungenlied*, 636-8. Leipzig, 1886.